



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 16, 2004

Ms. Alana Minton
Assistant District Attorney
Hospital District Office
Suite 300
1025 South Jennings
Fort Worth, Texas 76104

OR2004-9706

Dear Ms. Minton:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 212949.

The Tarrant County Hospital District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information "relating to the proposed sale or transfer of Osteopathic Medical Center of Texas ["OMCT"], Fort Worth." You state that some responsive information has been released to the requestor. You claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. You take no position regarding whether the requested information is proprietary, but have notified OMCT and the University of North Texas Health Science Center ("UNTHSC"), the interested third parties, of the request for information and of their opportunity to submit comments to this office. See Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). OMCT responded and asserts section 552.110. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, UNTHSC has not submitted any comments to this office explaining how release of the requested information would affect its proprietary interests. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information relating to UNTHSC is proprietary information, and none of it may be withheld on that basis. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

You contend that the information submitted in Exhibit G is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," and encompasses information protected by other statutes. You inform us that the request encompasses information arising from a closed session of the district's Board of Managers. The Open Meetings Act ("OMA"), which establishes the general rule that every meeting of every governmental body shall be open to the public, permits closed meetings for certain purposes. A governmental body that conducts a closed meeting must either keep a certified agenda or make a tape recording of the proceeding, except for private attorney consultations. Gov't Code §551.103. The agenda or tape is kept as potential evidence in litigation involving an alleged violation of the OMA. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-840 (1988). Section 551.104(c) of the Government Code provides that "[t]he certified agenda or tape of a closed meeting is available for public inspection and copying only under a court order issued under Subsection (b)(3)." Section 551.146 penalizes the unlawful disclosure of a certified agenda or tape recording of a lawfully closed meeting as a Class B misdemeanor, and makes the person responsible for disclosure liable for damages to a person injured or damaged by the disclosure. Thus, such information cannot be released to a member of the public in response to an open records request. *See* Open Records Decision No. 495 (1988). In addition, minutes of a closed meeting are confidential. *See* Open Records Decision No. 60 (1974) (closed meeting minutes are confidential under predecessor to section 551.104); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 563 (1990) (minutes of properly held executive session are confidential under OMA); Open Records Decision No. 495 (1988) (information protected under predecessor to section 551.104 cannot be released to member of public in response to open records request). Thus, the submitted information in Exhibit G is confidential under section 551.104(c) of the Government Code, and must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

You assert that some of the submitted records are excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) excepts from disclosure information protected by the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body.¹ TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives.² TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body seeking to establish that a communication is protected by the attorney-client privilege must inform this office of the identity and capacity of each individual involved in the communication. Finally, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a communication that is confidential. *Id.* 503(b)(1). A confidential communication is a communication that was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Whether a communication meets the definition of a confidential communication depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body.

¹ The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is acting in a capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Texas Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Because government attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, including as administrators, investigators, or managers, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element.

² Specifically, the privilege applies only to confidential communications between the client or a representative of the client and the client’s lawyer or a representative of the lawyer; between the lawyer and the lawyer’s representative; by the client or a representative of the client, or the client’s lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein; between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E); *see also id.* 503(a)(2), (a)(4) (defining “representative of the client,” “representative of the lawyer.”)

See Huie v. DeShazo, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that Exhibit F constitutes communications exchanged between privileged parties in furtherance of the rendition of legal services to a client. Accordingly, we conclude that the district may withhold the submitted information in Exhibit F pursuant to section 552.107(1).

OMCT argues that some of the documents submitted by the district in Exhibit D are not responsive to the instant request. The Act requires a governmental body to release only information that it believes to be responsive to a request. However, in determining whether information is responsive, a governmental body has a duty to make a good faith effort to relate the request to information that it holds. Open Records Decision No. 590 at 1 n.1 (1991). We have reviewed the information at issue and conclude that it is responsive to the request. We will therefore address whether the exception that OCMT claims applies.

OMCT claim that portions of the submitted information in Exhibit D are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained.” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). An entity will not meet its burden under section 552.110(b) by a mere conclusory assertion of a possibility of commercial harm. *Cf. National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765, 770 (D.C. Cir. 1974). Normally, an interested third party raising section 552.110(b) must provide a specific factual or evidentiary showing that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure of requested information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 639 at 4 (1996) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure).

Having considered OMCT’s arguments, we find that it has established that release of most of the information submitted as Exhibit D would cause OMCT harm. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b). However, we find that OMCT has made only conclusory allegations that release of the remaining information at issue would cause it substantial competitive injury and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld pursuant to section 552.110(b).

In summary, the submitted information in Exhibit G is confidential under section 551.104(c) of the Government Code, and must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. The district may withhold the information in Exhibit F pursuant to

section 552.107(1). The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b). The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877)673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512)475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this

ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/jh

Ref: ID# 212949
Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Mitch Mitchell
Fort Worth Star Telegram
P.O. Box 1870
Fort Worth, Texas 76101
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Justin Doheny
Osteopathic Medical Center of Texas
1000 Montgomery Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76107
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. William LeMaistre
University of North Texas Health Science Center
3500 Camp Bowie Boulevard
Fort Worth, Texas 76107
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Kimberly A. Frost
Vinson & Elkins, L.L.P.
The Terrace 7
Suite 100
2801 Via Fortuna
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)